

Appl. No. 09/666,951

Amendment dated May 25, 2005

Response to Office action April 25, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 remain in the application. The claims have been amended to ensure that the "core material" and the "core" is understood to be formed of a "hollow section."

Substance of Interview:

Applicant is in agreement with the Examiner's summary of the Interview dated March 21, 2005. The Examiner, her supervisor Jerry Lorengo, and applicant agreed that the Office action mailed March 7, 2005 should be withdrawn and a new Office action should issue. Also, a further interview was scheduled.

Applicant is also in agreement with the Examiner's summary of the Interview dated April 28, 2005. Applicant disagreed with the Examiner and her supervisor that the claim amendment filed November 12, 2004 was in effect a "switch" of inventions where the "solid core" invention had been constructively elected in the prior prosecution and the said amendment attempted to now change over to a distinct, non-elected "hollow core" invention. It was agreed that applicant would submit a paper which explained counsel's position. The following contains the required explanation.

Appl. No. 09/666,951

Amendment dated May 25, 2005

Response to Office action April 25, 2005

Coating a Hollow Core v. Coating a Solid Core:

Applicant provided in his last response a detailed and carefully drafted explanation concerning the change from "solid core" to "hollow core" in the amended claims. Applicant also provided an explanation concerning the introduction of the term "flexurally rigid hollow section" in claim 20. The Examiner apparently disagreed and issued the holding that the response with the amendment was considered non-responsive.

During the second above-noted interview, counsel pointed to the original specification in support of his contention that the amendment was not in effect a "switch" of inventions. Counsel specifically pointed to the original language of claim 7 which read, *inter alia*:

"the solid core material is formed of a hollow section" and argued that the original language properly supported the amendment. The Examiner and her supervisor disagreed and alleged that the introduction of "hollow core material" was not properly supported by the original language "hollow section."

In order to further the application, applicant has now amended the claims so as to use the exact language that appeared in

Appl. No. 09/666,951

Amendment dated May 25, 2005

Response to Office action April 25, 2005

the original specification and the claims (see, also, the drawing figures).

The entry of the amendment is requested, as well as the reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8 and 10-20.

Please charge any fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant

WERNER H. STEMER
REG. NO. 34,956

WHS:bh

May 25, 2005.

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101